UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No.	CV 12-05453 (JEMx)	B DMG (JEMx), 12	-06012 DMG	Date	August 21, 2012	
Title Ronald F. Vaughn v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A., et al. and Ronald Vaughn v. World Savings Bank, FSB, et al.						
Present: The Honorable DOLLY M. GEE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE						
VA	LERY		NOT REPORTED			
Deputy Clerk				Court Reporter		
	1 3				1	
Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)			Attorn	Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)		
None Present				None Present		

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS—ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTIONS SHOULD NOT BE CONSOLIDATED

On June 22, 2012, Plaintiff filed a complaint in this Court pertaining to property in Long Beach, California, which action is pending before this Court as case number CV 12-05453 DMG (JEMx). On June 28, 2012, Plaintiff filed what appears to be an identical complaint in the Los Angeles Superior Court, which Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. removed to this Court on July 12, 2012 on the basis of federal question jurisdiction. The second action is pending before this Court as case number CV 12-06012 DMG (JEMx).

A court may consolidate actions pending before it if they "involve a common question of law or fact." Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). District courts have broad discretion whether or not to consolidate actions. *Pierce v. County of Orange*, 526 F.3d 1190, 1203 (9th Cir. 2008) (citing *Investor's Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989)). In determining whether consolidation is appropriate, courts weigh "the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause." *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984).

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why case numbers CV 12-05453 DMG (JEMx) and CV 12-06012 should not be consolidated. Plaintiff shall file his response on or before August 31, 2012.

IT IS SO ORDERED.